

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. May I inquire how much time I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand, but there are a number, there are at least three, and I am not on the committee, and I didn't do exhaustive research, there are three others of these currently in use and currently in development. The Coast Guard, at least, apparently, believes that their system is better than this system.

So my question is, for this sort of earmark, are we going to fund, if there were a company, and all 435 of our districts that was interested in developing this thing, should we give them all \$1.5 million and see who wins?

I just don't think that this earmark, or, as I have said, hundreds of others out of the 1,300 that are in this bill, really meet the scrutiny when we are using taxpayer money and giving it to private companies to develop this stuff without the proper scrutiny in terms of this technology, did the military ask for it, is it effective, is it the right supplier, is it the right price and what do the taxpayers own when they are done paying for it.

I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 8110. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Marine Desalination Systems, Inc., in St. Petersburg, Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair. That last discussion was remarkable, just remarkable.

I would gladly yield time to anybody who agrees with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that, one, that these earmarks are competitively bid. Anybody in agreement here; or, two, that the U.S. taxpayer, after paying for these earmarks, has rights to the technology that developed these earmarks.

Any takers there? I didn't think so.

I think that is simply wrong. That is simply wrong.

An earmark, by very definition, is a sole source contract. It is circumventing the competitive bidding process.

Maybe you don't like what the bureaucrats over in the Defense Department do, but to say that this is a competitively bid contract is simply wrong. To say that the U.S. taxpayer has rights to the technology developed with the companies that are getting these earmarks, is simply wrong as well.

If anybody can contradict, please take time. But let's not defend these earmarks on that basis when that's simply wrong.

Any way, let's get to this one.

This earmark, I am sorry, this amendment would eliminate \$1 million for the Marine Desalination Systems, Inc., in St. Petersburg, Florida, for atmospheric water harvesting and reduce the cost of the bill by a corresponding amount.

The earmark described in the certification letter submitted to the committee by the sponsor informs us that this earmark would be used to fund lightweight, low power expeditionary water production.

According to the Web site of the entity, Marine Desalination Systems is a corporation that develops new technologies to create inexpensive, potable water, to bring to market.

Again, I have the same issue that the last gentleman to offer amendments did, the gentleman from California. Why are we singling out this one company for this project or this earmark?

I would ask similar questions to the ones he asked, but these, I think, are more in the defense speak that goes with the language in this bill.

Was this project palmed, which means, is it a program of memorandum? I would ask the sponsor that.

Is it on any unfunded requirement list? Number 3, does any operator in the field say that we need this particular program or technology from this particular company? I would love to hear the answer to any of those questions from the sponsor of the earmark.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman caught my attention when he said St. Petersburg, Florida, if that's where that company is located. I assume that it is because when I submitted the request in full transparency, I said it was from St. Petersburg, Florida.

This is a program that is important to the military. This is a defense-related issue.

there is no water. We have reverse osmosis. To do that, you have got to have some kind of liquid. We have desalinization. To do that you, have got to have saltwater. But how about getting water where there is none present? How about getting water out of the atmosphere? Because there is water in the atmosphere. And this company has proved they can do it. And this company's product is being tested at Aberdeen Proving Grounds by the United States Army.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman, do we really want to deny our troops the opportunity to have a system that provides water from the air? And it works. It is working in Aberdeen. Do you really want to deny troops the opportunity to have a portable unit that will provide water for troops that are deployed in outrageous places where there is no water? If that is what you want to do, then you should vote for this amendment. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. If the gentleman would yield, I also oppose the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Let me just finish. Nobody is trying to deny anybody any water, certainly not somebody from Arizona. But the question remains, was this a program of memorandum? Is it on any unfunded requirement list? Does any operator in the field say that we need this particular program or technology from this particular company?

I would be glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Let me give you the type of question you are asking. Last year, I was chairman of this subcommittee. Last year, we had a request through the administration for a supplemental of \$70 billion. We asked the administration, what would you like to include in that \$70 billion? What did you need? We didn't get an answer.

We didn't get an answer, so after repeated requests we had to go to the services who were fighting the war and say to them, what do you need? And we identified those items and we put them in that \$70 billion supplemental, which most of us voted for. So I was responsible for and got credit for a \$70 billion earmark. Everything is not black and white in this world.

And so I say to the gentleman, I appreciate his tenacity, but I would like to have an opportunity to debate with you the many good things that have been done to defend our Nation and support our troops that have been done created by the Congress, not requested by any administration.

One of the very best earmarks that I can give you an example of off the top of my head is the Predator, the Predator that the Iraqi terrorists really hate because it hunts them down and it kills them. The Predator was a congressional earmark. The administration, the Defense Department didn't ask for it, didn't give us any support. We said we need this capability, and we